

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 12-20 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration of the claims in the application is respectfully requested.

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

In the Office Action, claims 1, 12, and 17 were rejected as being indefinite and suggestions are made to include additional limitations in the preamble. For example, a suggestion that claim 1 recite "a database table recovery system for ...," instead of "a system for ..." is made. Applicants traverse this rejection. The suggested feature is claimed as an element in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants believe that additional limitation in the preamble is not necessary and the claim 1 is definite without the suggested phrase.

Claim 12 recites "A method of recovering a first database table that depends on a tablespace..." Applicants also submit that there is no indefiniteness about this claim.

Claim 17 recites "A method for recovering a database table that depends on a tablespace..." A tablespace inherently involves using machine memory units, accordingly, Applicants submit that it is not necessary to insert "computer implemented method" as suggested in the Office Action. To summarize,

Applicants believe that claims 1, 12, and 17 definitely point out and claim the subject matter.

Claims 6, 12, and 17 were rejected because, according to the Office Action, the term "table" is unclear. However, claims 6, 12, and 17 recite "the database table." Accordingly, no amendment is believed to be necessary. Further, although claims 13 and 14 recite "a first table" and "a second table," a table that depends on a tablespace inherently refers to a database table. Accordingly, Applicants believe "a first table" and "a second table" claimed in claims 13 and 14 are not indefinite.

For the above proffered reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

Claim objections

Claims 17 and 19 are amended according to the suggestion in the Office Action. Applicants believe the objection are overcome.

Claim rejection - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-6 and 12-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,721,915 ("Socket et al.") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,517,641 ("Barry et al."). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Socket et al. appears discloses reorganizing the table space by copying table space in use to a new area and applying logs to the newly copied table space. Sockut et al. does not disclose, suggest, or teach to recover a database table without recovering the tablespace. Rather, Socket et al. teaches to modify the tablespace in order to reorganize it. Indeed, not recovering the tablespace would destroy the intended purpose of Socket et al., which is to create a new reorganized tablespace.

Barry et al. also does not disclose, suggest, or teach recovering a database table without recovering the tablespace as claimed in independent claims 1, 12, and 17. Accordingly, it is submitted that independent claims 1, 12, and 17 and their respective dependent claims are not obvious over Sockut et al. and Barry et al.

Allowable subject matter


Claims 5 and 6 are indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The claims are being amended accordingly and they are now in allowable forms.

This communication is believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and every effort has been made to place the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a

favorable Office Action is hereby earnestly solicited.

If a telephone interview would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, Examiner is requested to telephone the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eunhee Park
Registration No.42,926
Baker & McKenzie
805 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
Telephone (212) 751-5700
Facsimile (212) 759-9133